Rising Tide for Disengagement, P. 2

Our Own Red Expose: Lifting the Lid on Chairman Walter's Anti Anti-Communist Past, Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VII, NO. 5 FEBRUARY 2, 1959 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

How We Rule Russia, and They Rule Us

In a very real sense, the U.S. is ruled from Moscow and Russia in turn is ruled from Washington. The size of our arms budget this year and next, as everyone knows, is likely to be shaped by whether concessions from the Kremlin offer the possibility of a meaningful disarmament agreement. A burst of bellicosity on our part could in turn take the shoes from millions of Russian consumers by stimulating a greater diversion of effort there away from consumer goods to war materials. Both governments, like all governments, whatever their ideologies, may be divided in their directing personnel between "hards" and "softs." The former believe that safety lies in being as tough and unyielding as possible; the latter, in seeking a modus vivendi by conciliation. Their "hards" help ours, and our "softs" strengthen theirs. When a general on one side talks of how easily he can bomb umteen cities on the other, his opposite number generals have a clincher in their argument for larger arms appropriations. When their side talks in conciliatory tones, it strengthens the hand of those who believe in conciliation here. The Germans may still be divided but we and the Russians live in a curious confederation, bound together by hatred, anxiety and fear, giant Siamese twins doomed to live or die together on the same small earth.

Some on Our Side, Too, Prefer Stalinism

As in a marriage, one partner can influence the other for good or ill, and it is hard to avoid the feeling that we are again missing a chance to mold Russia closer to the image we would like it to assume. The Krushchev regime is if anything exaggerating the success of the Mikoyan visit in order to sell its people and party on the possibility of more peaceful relations with the U.S. Should it fail to come up with some concrete agreements in the next few months moderating the cold war and moving toward a general relaxation of tension, it may be replaced by a Stalinist old guard with a tougher line. We missed a bet in not dealing with Malenkov. Krushchev is tougher. His successor may be worse. To meet advances with rigidity is to strengthen rigidity there. To make the Russians feel that it is hopeless to try and be friendly is to encourage all the elements there who believe the only safety lies in an omnipresent secret police, an iron curtain and a grim face outward. There is no doubt that there are elements here which would prefer a Stalinist Russia, as there are elements there which would prefer us to prove for them the thesis that nothing but hatred and war is to be expected from an encircling capitalism.

The first reports here of the Krushchev speech to the new party congress suggest fruitful avenues of mutually profitable negotiation. He added Hungary to the list of countries from which he would withdraw troops in a Central European disengagement. He asked for international agreement to destroy not only nuclear but missile stockpiles. Most significantly of all, he spoke of creating an "atom free" area in the Far East and the Pacific; such an agreement might be one way to prevent the new China from becoming a nuclear power, a development which would enormously add to our problems. One has only to read the vivid reports Richard Crossman has been writing for the London *New Statesman and Nation* on his visit to Peking to see that the Chinese Communists in their isolation are developing a mentality far more rigid than that of the most hidebound Russian Communists. Their propaganda is constructing for their people an unreal world in which it will become increasingly difficult to deal with them.

Yet there is no real sign here of any readiness for genuine negotiations. Mr. Eisenhower at press conference was well-meaning but inane. Mr. Dulles the day before showed his genius for the equivocal, arousing some hope among those who looked between the right lines. But next day before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee what seemed to be cracks in the ice had frozen over solidly. Though he volunteered the extraordinary admission that "We never had, and do not now have, any substantial differences with the Soviet Union," he was soon producing quotations from his favorite bedside book, Stalin's *Problems of Leninism* (1926) to prove there could be no common ground between us and a regime "based upon atheism and materialism and upon the belief that human beings are but animated particles of matter. . . ." It would seem from this that the cold war will end as soon as there is a mass baptism in the Kremlin.

Mr. Acheson is reported to be happy again with Mr. Dulles, as may easily be believed from the Secretary's remark to the Senate Committee, "The principles of our policy were first announced in 1947." That was the year the Truman-Acheson cold war policy began.

Speaking of Monolithic Societies

Peter Lisagor (Chicago Daily News): I wonder whether you could tell us whether you have had any personal reflections from friends in private life, who may have talked with Mr. Mikoyan, that the United States Government might make agreements with Russia if it had a less rigid position?

The President: No, no, I never did. . . . I had reports from friends around the country that called me up, one of them in California I recall, saying it was obvious there was an attempt on the part of Mr. Mikoyan to make this interpretation, that the people in the government were particularly divided on certain points. . . .

Now, because of these reports . . . these friends made a special point of meetings—a meeting with Mr. Mikoyan during the course of the evening, and asserting their belief that the United States, in its firmness in refusing to retreat a single inch from its rights and from its obligations and responsibility, that all of us were one. . . . —*Press Conference, January 28*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hope Reflected in Sixth Annual Conference on World Disarmament and Development

Need to Combine Disengagement With Arms Control Stressed

Measured against the urgency of the issues, the turnout and news coverage of the Sixth National Conference on World Disarmament and Development held here the week-end of January 23-24 was small. Measured against the realities of popular apathy, an indifferent press and the conferences of past year, it was a vibrant affair; the several hundred delegates from 20 organizations reflected perhaps for the first time an atmosphere of hope and a consciousness that they really spoke for a voiceless majority. I have never attended a conference in which the ratio of useful discussion to windy generalities was so refreshingly high, and I hope readers will write the Friends Committee on National Legislation (104 C St. NE, Wash., DC) for the prepared papers and summaries available. The Conference, which was originally a Women's International League for Peace and Freedom project, is taking on momentum; its 20 sponsoring organizations operate through a coordinating committee during the year.

Labor Unions Conspicuously Absent

The biggest gap to be filled is represented by the labor movement. Though the National Farmers Union was a sponsor and even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce participated (in the panel on the problems of reconverting industry from the arms race), no labor organization was on the list of sponsors and only two unions took part in the panels: Reuther's Auto Workers, to his and their credit, sent three able panelists: Paul Sifton, Lee Goodman and Samuel Jacobs; the State, County and Municipal Employes was represented by Sanford Gottlieb, administrative assistant to its progressive minded president, Arnold S. Zander.

Of all the Presidential hopefuls, the only one to turn up at the conference was Humphrey, who has made disarmament his cause and pushed it tirelessly against heavy obstacles. Two Congressmen, Reuss of Wisconsin and Porter of Oregon took part in panels: Edith Green (Ore.), Byron Johnson (Col.), John Brademas (Ind.) and Leonard Wolf (Iowa), all Democrats, were among the Congressmen who attended. Senator Green put in an appearance. From the inner councils of the Democratic party came Benjamin V. Cohen and Leon Keyserling. Former Senator Flanders of Vermont, who did so much to destroy McCarthy's power, was there on the platform with Norman Thomas, who spoke with all his old inspiring pungency: "What I have to say cannot be dismissed by insisting that since Russia is or has been worse than we, we don't need to try to be better. The insistence that no valid and secure agreements for proper sanctions can be reached with the Kremlin can't be proved until far more earnest, imaginative, yes, and realistic efforts are made. We are working for peace, not for a better or less bad record on some celestial scoreboard."

No Hurry

Q. Dr. [Hans] Bothe said a few days ago that he thought more sensitive instruments could be developed for detection [of nuclear tests]. Are there any plans for such a development by the AEC?

Chairman McCone: Not at the present time; no.

—AEC Press Conference, Jan. 21.

Of the new data on nuclear testing, Humphrey said "we should not appear to be trying to find an excuse for calling the whole thing off." He welcomed the new Western concession at Geneva in agreeing not to make test cessation dependent on other arms issues. He warned the Russians "without the right of inspection of events which could be suspected of being nuclear explosions, it is difficult to see how the Geneva negotiations can be successful," and said that "enough foreigners must be on the staff of the control apparatus in each country" to maintain confidence. He told of his annual struggle to get a few thousand dollars for his disarmament subcommittee amid the billions spent for arms and added wryly, "you can pretty well tell where a nation's heart is by where it puts its money."

Perhaps the most striking aspect of the discussions is that at least five speakers in their various ways stressed the need for combining meaures of "disengagement" in central Europe with arms control: Humphrey, Thomas, Cohen, Reuss and Frederick Kuh of the *Chicago Sun-Times*. Congressman Reuss was impressively literate and informed on the subject.

Mr. Cohen, veteran of the New Deal, and of the State Department, and of many parlays with the Russians, spoke with a patient wisdom and a weary irony of the necessity for negotiation and co-existence. Mr. Cohen said "Some people who study their ideology end up by becoming more enamored of it than the Russians themselves. They come to believe that coexistence not only cannot but should not succeed." The portrait seemed strikingly to resemble John Foster Dulles, who is quite vain about his Marxism-Leninism.

Next Step Must Be Missile Control—The Fallacy of The "Fool-Proof"

"Owing to the high destructive capability of larger missile warheads, even a minor proportion of attacking missiles would devastate major industrial areas.

"At the present time, however, long-range intercontinental missiles with such capability, well-concealed in prepared launching sites, are apparently as yet unavailable to the major powers in quantity. This fact may soon become out-dated owing to the massive resources being applied to the development of missile technologies. The present condition, however, still offers major opportunities for international disarmament agreements which, by inspection, could serve to prevent the further development of the missile art and thereby relieve the major industrial populations of the earth from this source of surprise attack . . . an international agreement, making use of a network of stations similar to the one now proposed for the bomb test agreement, could efficiently police an international missile-testing moratorium. . . .

"In assessing the worth of disarmament agreements and their allied inspection systems, it is essential to keep in view a realistic understanding of the reliability problem . . . uncertainty and risk are always present in an inspection system. The choice that must be made is between the uncertainties of inspected disarmament agreements, as against the well-assured extinction of humankind. . . .

". . . to insist upon 'fool-proof inspection' is tantamount to excluding the acceptability of any disarmament and any inspection system."

—Prof. Seymour Melman of Columbia, at the Sixth Nat'l Conf. on World Disarmament, Washington, D.C. Jan. 23

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why the Un-American Chairman Ought to Be Subpoenaed in the Braden-Wilkinson Trial

Let's Lift A Curtain on Mr. Walter's Own *Anti* Anti-Communist Past

We hope the defense in the forthcoming contempt trials of Harvey O'Connor, Carl Braden and Frank Wilkinson will subpoena Chairman Francis E. Walter of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and ask him under oath why these three men were ever summoned by the Committee. We believe the answer and the circumstances will show that even under the vague mandate on which the Committee operates, it had no authority to call them. Whatever "un-American activities" may mean they can hardly be stretched to cover criticism of the Committee itself.

The trials in Atlanta which have just ended with the conviction of Braden and Wilkinson (and the imposition of a maximum 12-month sentence on the latter) show that they were subpoenaed for trying to help victims of the Committee and to bring about its abolition. It would be strange if in a section of the country where the sharpest criticism of the Supreme Court is a commonplace, criticism of the Un-American Committee is a crime. We believe the outcome on appeal will be another defeat for the Committee, another blow at its crumbling power.

Joining Forces With Eastland

We also believe the two Atlanta cases, when the facts come fully to public knowledge, will provide an answer to Chairman Walter's indignant denial on the floor of the House January 9 that his Committee had ever "harassed Americans who work for racial equality and justice." Among the questions Braden refused to answer were several dealing with his activities in connection with the Southern Conference Educational Fund, which has been working for inter-racial justice in the South. Wilkinson was subpoenaed (under circumstances which seem to indicate wire-tapping by Committee agents) when he went to Atlanta to help Braden.

Hate bombers seem to be able to operate in the South with impunity, but idealists who have devoted their lives to helping the Negro and to fighting for civil liberties are easily convicted. In this respect the Walter committee has been imitating the Eastland committee. Both have been contributing to the dangerous delusion that grips a sizeable portion of the South, the notion that the colored man's struggle for equality is a Communist plot.

When We Praised Walter

We hope that on the stand Chairman Walter will be interrogated about some of his own past activities. In a speech prepared for delivery as we were going to press, Congressman James Roosevelt read the House the full text of the front page article we published in our issue of January 19 criticizing the way he was going about his move to abolish the Committee. We emphasized the danger of substituting a Seditious Activities Committee. Mr. Roosevelt seemed to be using our criticism of him as a way to clear himself in the eyes of the House by showing that he was being attacked from the left. If the *Weekly's* attitude is to be a kind of loyalty standard, then it clears Mr. Roosevelt but puts Mr. Walter in jeopardy. For on two occasions the *Weekly* has reported favorably on Mr. Walter's activities. Once was when he gave us an interview attacking as unconstitutional the Smith-Ferguson bill to deprive of citizenship native born persons convicted under the Smith Act. The second was when he (along with Clyde Doyle of California) filed a minority report from the Un-American Activities Committee opposing the Brownell-Butler bill. Indeed the *Weekly* was the only publication which published the text of their report.

That report (HR Rept. 2651 Part 2, 83rd Cong. 2d Sess.) makes relevant reading now. The bill was designed to add a new category of suspect organizations to those already subjected by the Internal Security Act of 1950 to registration with the Subversive Activities Control Board. In addition to "Communist" and "Communist Action" organizations, "Communist infiltrated" unions and other organizations were to register. These were organizations which were not Communist controlled but into which it could be shown that Communists had "infiltrated."

Some Guilty Associations

Mr. Walter, the *Wall Street Journal* and the *Weekly* were guilty of association in the fight against that bill, and if it had not been for a panicky stampede by liberals in the Senate, Mr. Walter would have blocked it. As it was, it became part of the Anti-Communist Control Act of 1954. The important point to notice is that the grounds on which Mr. Walter (and Mr. Doyle) objected to the legislation then are exactly the grounds on which they attack the "abolition" forces now. They objected then that the bill "fails to make clear that an organization is to be proscribed only if it was deliberately used for the purpose and with the motive of promoting communism. It seems—though surely that would not be the intent—to permit conviction upon a mere showing of a coincidence of views on some subjects between the accused organization and the Communist party."

Isn't Mr. Walter now attacking people who want to abolish the Committee on just such grounds of "coincidence"? If it is a crime to agitate for abolition of the Committee, is Mr. Walter himself guiltless? It is hardly a secret in the newspaper corps here that Mr. Walter on several occasions in the past few years has expressed disgust with the witch hunt, and told reporters that he himself was going to move to abolish it. Mr. Walter is too good a lawyer not to be acutely uncomfortable on occasion about the Committee's activities. All this too ought to be opened up when and if Mr. Walter is subpoenaed in the forthcoming trials of the "abolitionist" leaders, O'Connor, Braden and Wilkinson.

Fight Building Up

As for Mr. Roosevelt, his new speech began gingerly to fight, though he was still trying to make it clear that he had come not to bury Caesar but to rehabilitate him. For all his queasy approach, he alone is carrying on a fight on the House floor and deserves applause for it. He has opened up an avenue through which full hearings may yet be forced in House Rules. Every American who believes in liberty ought to write his Congressman and ask that he fight for hearings on the Roosevelt resolution, and oppose on the floor the $327,000 appropriation for Un-American Activities approved by House Administration without the public hearing its chairman, Omar Burleson, has often promised.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fears of A Spanish Castro; New French Premier for Co-Existence; Our Unapproachable Speaker

Kefauver Ignored When He Exposes the Real Nature of Our Price Inflation

Though inflation is a No. 1 topic here, an almost complete blanket of silence covered the opening of a new round of hearings by Kefauver's anti-trust and monopoly subcommittee into administered prices. The liberal Democrats and their labor allies are content to talk demagogically of more spending as an economic cure-all, ducking the hard problems. Senator Kefauver's opening statement pointed out that current price rises do not follow the classical pattern of rising demand with inadequate supply. "The 1957 increase in steel prices," he pointed out, "came on the heels of six months in which the industry's operating rate averaged little more than half capacity. Automobile prices were increased sharply last fall, at a time when buyers were willing to take only about half of the cars which the industry actually produced in 1955." Prices rise while production and employment fall. The market is no longer free. The problem is whether it is to be planned and controlled by a few great industries so they can maintain profits in a restricted market.

Double Standard on Dictatorships

When the Hungarian revolutionaries lynched secret police agents in Budapest, they were applauded but when Castro (with much more orderly procedure) executes Batista's torturers, there is a manufactured storm of indignation. Without wishing to endorse "revolutionary justice" (sometimes only a mask for ignorant mob violence), it strikes us Latin Americans must be disgusted, remembering the silence of our press and Congress in the years when Batista and other Latin American dictators killed and tortured with impunity. We are even now sending a Marine mission to train the forces of the dictator in Haiti, and they will be available to help Trujillo in neighboring Santo Domingo, where Batista has taken refuge. The two dictatorships on that island of Hispaniola, and those in Nicaragua and Paraguay, are the last left in Latin America. What Washington fears is that the contagion of the successful uprisings (and the generally friendly attitude taken by the dominant Roman Catholic Church toward them) will encourage similar action in the shaky Spanish mother country where we have many bases. What happens if revolution comes against Franco? Will we supply him?

Except for a Reuters dispatch in the *Chicago Tribune*, no U.S. paper we saw covered the fact that the new French Premier Michel Debre in his opening policy statement to the new National Assembly said in discussing NATO that it "must constantly show that it is ready for co-existence" and stressed "the unparalleled suffering that would result from a rejection of co-existence." His government insists, however, that France must become "an atomic military power."

Our favorite Freudian slip of the new Congress was in the statement with which Cong. Ashley (D. Ohio) refused to serve as assistant Democratic whip of the House in protest against the Southern oligarchy. But he said, "I'm not taking on Rayburn. As a Speaker, he's beyond approach."

New House Foreign Affairs Appointments

Lack of space in a flood of more urgent matters forces us to postpone our promised survey of new committee assignments in the House. We note with satisfaction, however, that Chester Bowles (D. Conn.) and Wm. H. Meyer (D. Vt.) have been placed on Foreign Affairs. Few men in Washington are as well equipped as Mr. Bowles for that post, Mr. Meyer campaigned for an independent foreign policy, advocating recognition of Communist China and an end of nuclear testing. The other successful "peace" candidate, Byron L. Johnson (D. Col.), a member of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, was given his second choice, Banking and Currency (his first was Agriculture); he is a former professor of economics at the University of Denver.

We also note that Chas. O. Porter (D. Ore.), now serving his second term, was punished by the House leadership for his courageous exposure of the Galindez case and the Trujillo regime's complicity in it. Mr. Porter asked for Appropriations, Foreign Affairs, or Judiciary but was given no new post and left on Post Office and Civil Service. This liberal Democrat from Oregon is a hero in Latin America; he has created much good will below the border for our country; he has made Latin Americans feel they again have a champion in Congress. But the friends of Trujillo (including Majority Leader McCormack) were stronger.

Why Not Send Your New Congressman A Gift Sub to the Weekly?

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional: 2/2/59

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED